

Appendix F - The Progressive Message

I've been watching some video clips of Obama and his supporters, trying to figure out what the mutual admiration is about. It's obvious that those who oppose his policies are those who end up victims of theft, while those who support his policies are those who end up receiving the stolen goods. But that isn't how the Robin Hood message is usually presented. It is repackaged into compassion for the downtrodden, as if those of us who have worked our way up in life through our own initiative have been placing the heel of our boots on those who didn't get rich. The following quotes are an example of the Progressive story; it still resonates today in some circles.

"As a rule he [the downtrodden worker] arrives in the big city with a certain amount of money; he has no need to lose heart on the very first day if he has the ill fortune to find no work for any length of time. But it is worse if, after finding a job, he soon loses it. To find a new one, especially in winter, is often difficult if not impossible. Even so, the first weeks are tolerable. He receives an unemployment benefit from his union funds and manages as well as possible. But when his last cent is gone and the union, due to the long duration of his unemployment, discontinues its payments, great hardships begin."

This is a common story opener, one which we can all shake our heads at in agreement, feeling compassion for the well-meaning but defeated worker.

"Now he walks the streets, hungry; often he pawns and sells his last possessions; his clothing becomes more and more wretched; and thus he sinks into external surroundings, which, on top of his physical misfortune, also poisons his soul. If he is evicted (as is so often the case) this occurs in winter, his misery is very great. At length he finds some sort of job again. But the old story is repeated. The same thing happens a second time, the third time perhaps it is even worse, and little by little he learns to bear the eternal insecurity with greater and greater indifference. At last the repetition becomes a habit."

Now I'm starting to feel ashamed of myself for having any animosity towards the SEIU union worker and the Wisconsin protester. The deck seems to be stacked against him.

"And so this man, who was formerly so hard-working, grows lax in his whole view of life and gradually becomes the instrument of those who use him only for their own base advantage. He has so often been unemployed through no fault of his own that one time more or less ceases to matter, even when the aim is no longer to fight for economic rights, but to destroy political, social, or cultural values in general ... With open eyes I was able to follow this process in a thousand examples. The more I witnessed it, the greater grew my revulsion for the big city which first avidly sucked men in and then so cruelly crushed them."

By now, the Progressive storyteller has everyone mesmerized. Who could not feel sorry for the downtrodden worker and revulsion for the evil company that did this to him? And who is best qualified to rescue him, coincidentally, but the enlightened politician?

"A politician is the kind of man whose only real conviction is lack of conviction, combined with offensive impertinence and an art of lying, often developed to the point of complete shamelessness. If due to the misfortune of decent people such a character gets into a parliament, we may as well realize at once that the essence of his politics will from now on consist in nothing but an heroic struggle for the permanent

possession of his feeding-bottle for himself and his family. The more his wife and children depend on it, the more tenaciously he will fight for his mandate.”

Of course, this is how the Democrats try to one-up the Republicans morally. The Progressives are the saviors of the worker, the conservatives his exploiter. The Progressives want change, the conservatives want inertia.

“Isn’t every deed of genius in this world a visible protest of genius against the inertia of the mass? And what should the statesman do, who does not succeed in gaining the favor of this mob for his plans by flattery? In view of the great masses’ small capacity for thought, we need not be surprised at the success of these methods.”

Not only are they not surprised at these methods, they use them profusely and proficiently. Predictably, after their success at the polls, the “hope and change” crowd initiates the total destruction of the economic system that allegedly made life so miserable for the downtrodden worker.

“The most important economic measures are thus submitted to a forum, only a tenth of whose members have any economic education to show. This is nothing more or less than placing the ultimate decision in a matter in the hands of men totally lacking in every prerequisite for the task. The decision is always made by a majority of ignoramuses and incompetents, since the composition of this institution remains unchanged while the problems under treatment extend to nearly every province of public life ... Unfortunately we are here confronted, for the most part, not with ‘thinkers,’ but with dilettantes as limited as they are conceited and inflated, intellectual *demi-monde* of the worse sort ... Such an institution can only please the biggest liars and sneaks of the sort that shun the light of day, because it is inevitably hateful to an honorable, straightforward man who welcomes personal responsibility.”

Here’s where the agenda switch begins. A small group of enlightened socialist leaders, led by a person gifted in the art of rhetoric, slowly change the content of their message as their reengineered economic walls come crumbling down.

“As regards the possibility of putting these ideas into practice, I beg you not to forget that the parliamentary principle of democratic majority rule has by no means always dominated mankind, but on the contrary is to be found only in brief periods of history, *which are always epochs of the decay of peoples and states* ... The movement should today adapt itself entirely to these ideas and carry them to practical fruition within its own organization, so that some day, it may not only show the state these same guiding principles, but can also *place the completed body of its own state at its disposal*.”

Things are beginning to get clearer now. There is an underlying philosophy here, not just political parties jockeying for primacy. Behind the philosophy which challenges Constitutional orthodoxy is an agenda of despotic domination of the people.

“Political parties are inclined to compromises; philosophies never. Political parties even reckon with opponents; philosophies proclaim their infallibility.”

That explains how a political party (Democrat) can be hijacked by an alien philosophy, and an opposing political party (Republican) can be pushed aside and totally ignored. The *religious philosophy* is more important than mere politics. And how does it succeed?

“The strength of a political party lies by no means in the greatest possible independent intellect of the individual members, but rather in the disciplined obedience with which its members follow the intellectual leadership. The decisive factor is the leadership itself.”

That explains why the will of the people can be ignored, because their will is considered to be uninformed, ignorant, and disobedient. Notice how quickly the people are brushed aside as irrelevant once the new administration takes over. So what happens when an objection to the agenda is raised, for instance, by the Tea Partiers?

“In every single speech it was important to realize clearly in advance the presumable content and form of the objections to be expected in the discussion, and to pull every one of them apart in the speech itself. Here it was expedient to cite the possible objections ourselves at the outset and demonstrate their untenability; thus, the listener, even if he had come stuffed full of the objections he had been taught, but otherwise with an honest heart, was more easily won over when we disposed of the doubts that had been imprinted on his memory. The stuff that had been drummed into him was automatically refuted and his attention drawn more and more to the speech.”

So constitutionalists would be those who provide objections to the socialist agenda, drumming these objections into the rest of us. Obama’s job would be to brush those objections aside as nonsense, and get us to refocus on his eloquent speaking ability.

“Every such meeting represents a wrestling bout between two opposing forces. The superior oratorical art of a dominating preacher will succeed more easily in winning to the new will people who have themselves experienced a weakening of their force of resistance in the most natural way than those who are still in full possession of their mental tension and will.”

There lies the rub. About 40% of the US population are weak and no longer in full possession of their mental faculties and will. They are ripe for sophistry and no amount of historical education seems to have any effect on them.

“If popularity, force, and tradition combine, an authority may be regarded as unshakable ... In an hour when a national body is visibly collapsing and to all appearances is exposed to the gravest oppression, thanks to the activity of a few scoundrels, obedience and fulfillment of duty toward them amount to doctrinaire formalism, in fact pure insanity, if the refusal of obedience and fulfillment of duty would make possible the salvation of a people from its ruin.”

The goal of the new agenda is to bring the current system down, and when things are unbearably miserable and chaotic, to combine popularity, force, and a new tradition to save the people from themselves. In a way, this sounds like Ayn Rand’s premise in *Atlas Shrugged*. But in reality, this movement I am referring to took a different historical turn.

“What we needed was (and still need are) not a hundred or two hundred reckless conspirators, but a hundred thousand and a second hundred thousand fighters for our philosophy of life. We should not work in secret conventicles, but in mighty mass demonstrations, and it is not by dagger and poison or pistol that the road can be cleared for the movement, but by the conquest of the streets.”

So at some time in the future, I can see the conspirators organizing in the streets to a much greater degree, for the purpose of quelling all objections to the socialist takeover. Tea Partiers may not be given the luxury of continued peaceful protest at that time.

By the way, all shaded quotations in this brief are courtesy of Adolf Hitler in *Mein Kampf*.

Mein Kampf, Adolph Hiter, 1998, Mariner Books.